



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,975	06/13/2001	Thomas J. Sonderman	2000.045300	5882
23720	7590	06/08/2005		
WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON, P.C. 10333 RICHMOND, SUITE 1100 HOUSTON, TX 77042				
			EXAMINER KIELIN, ERIK J	
			ART UNIT 2813	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/880,975

Applicant(s)

SONDERMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Erik Kielin

Art Unit

2813

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 2-6, 13-21 and 23-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 7-12 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 4 March 2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A restatement of the Request for Information under 37 CFR 1.105 is provided.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options, **as well as provide the information requested under 37 CFR 1.105:**

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

Requirements for information

2. Examiner requests information under 37 CFR 1.105 regarding the following. The instant specification indicates that the devices of Rudolph and Tencor may be used as metrology instruments. Examiner requests that Applicant's provide all information available to them regarding the metrology tools including the manuals used to run the instruments and the data processing capabilities available for commercial use.

37 CFR § 1.105 states,

§ 1.105 Requirements for information.

(a)

(1) In the course of examining or treating a matter in a pending or abandoned application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111 or 371 (including a reissue application), in a patent, or in a reexamination proceeding, the examiner or other Office employee may require the submission, from individuals

Art Unit: 2813

identified under § 1.56(c), or any assignee, of such information as may be reasonably necessary to properly examine or treat the matter, for example:

(i) *Commercial databases*: The existence of any particularly relevant commercial database known to any of the inventors that could be searched for a particular aspect of the invention.

(ii) *Search*: Whether a search of the prior art was made, and if so, what was searched.

(iii) *Related information*: A copy of any non-patent literature, published application, or patent (U.S. or foreign), by any of the inventors, that relates to the claimed invention.

(iv) *Information used to draft application*: A copy of any non-patent literature, published application, or patent (U.S. or foreign) that was used to draft the application.

(v) *Information used in invention process*: A copy of any non-patent literature, published application, or patent (U.S. or foreign) that was used in the invention process, such as by designing around or providing a solution to accomplish an invention result.

(vi) *Improvements*: Where the claimed invention is an improvement, identification of what is being improved.

(vii) *In Use*: Identification of any use of the claimed invention known to any of the inventors at the time the application was filed notwithstanding the date of the use.

(2) Where an assignee has asserted its right to prosecute pursuant to § 3.71(a) of this chapter, matters such as paragraphs (a)(1)(i), (iii), and (vii) of this section may also be applied to such assignee.

(3) Any reply that states that the information required to be submitted is unknown and/or is not readily available to the party or parties from which it was requested will be accepted as a complete reply.

(b) The requirement for information of paragraph (a)(1) of this section may be included in an Office action, or sent separately.

(c) A reply, or a failure to reply, to a requirement for information under this section will be governed by §§ 1.135 and 1.136.

This is repeated from the Office action filed 17 May 2005.

While Examiner acknowledges that Applicant opines in the Response filed 6 August 2004 that the request for information was believed moot for Applicant's attempt to remove a statement of admitted prior art from the specification, it is not. As stated in the Office action made final, filed 25 October 2004, and repeated herein below, the removal of the admitted prior art from the specification is **new matter**. Accordingly, Applicant should have been aware that

Art Unit: 2813

the Request for Information under 37 CFR 1.105 stood since Applicant was informed that Applicant's reason for believing the information to be unnecessary was in fact new matter. It is further noted that Applicant failed to correct the new matter issue.

Failure to provide a proper reply to the above request for information will result in a holding of **intentionally non-responsive**.

Specification

3. The amendment filed 23 August 2004 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: The Amendment to the specification removes admissions of prior art and accordingly introduces new matter. These portions must not be removed.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2813

5. Claims 1, 7-12, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,428,673 B1 (**Ritzdorf** et al.) in view of US 6,221,765 B1 (**Ueno**) and US 6,298,470 B1 (**Breiner** et al.).

Regarding claims 1 and 22, **Ritzdorf** discloses a method for controlling a thickness of an electroplated copper layer for **damascene** and **dual damascene** structures (col. 3, lines 10-21; col. 5, line 17) using feedback from metrology comprising,

forming a first copper layer;

measuring an actual thickness of the copper layer “**and/or other parameters**” (col. 9, lines 52-54);

comparing the actual thickness to a desired thickness; and

varying at least one parameter used to form the first copper layer in response to the actual thickness differing from the desired thickness **and the “other parameters.”** (See Abstract; col. 3, line 64 to col. 4, line 15; col. 4, lines 37-65; col. 5, lines 2-5; col. 7, lines 36-45; col. 8, lines 49-53.)

Ritzdorf does not indicate that the mechanical stress relating to said first copper layer is measured and used for process control but, as noted, **Ritzdorf** suggests measurement of “other parameters” (called “metrology data”) of the copper layer and the used of the measured other parameters to feedback or feed forward process control (*inter alia* at col. 9, lines 50-65).

Ueno teaches an electroplated damascene copper structure (e.g. in Fig. 1) wherein compressive stress is intentionally introduced into the copper layer during fabrication to prevent void generation (col. 3, lines 23-48).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to measure and use for process control (in the claim language “varying at least one parameter used to form the first copper layer in response to) the mechanical stress in order to ensure and to control the quantity of compressive stress in the copper layer to thereby prevent stress-induced voiding, as taught by **Ueno** -- especially since **Ritzdorf** suggests measuring other parameters of the copper layer and use the measured parameters for process feedback and feed forward control.

Both **Ritzdorf** and **Ueno** are drawn to electroplated damascene copper interconnect for semiconductor device fabrication and therefore, one of ordinary skill is ensured a reasonable expectation of success in combining the references.

Ritzdorf does not describe the damascene process disclosed therein.

Ueno teaches the basic copper damascene process known to one of ordinary skill also includes the formation of the dielectric with the opening, or in Applicant’s claim language,

forming a first dielectric layer **2** above a first structure layer **1**;

forming a first opening **5** in the first dielectric layer **2** (called “trench patterning and “via patterning”);

forming a first copper layer **6** above the first dielectric layer **2** and in the first opening **5**.

(See **Ueno** Figs. 1-5.)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to form the damascene structure in **Ritzdorf**, according to steps indicated in **Ueno**, because **Ritzdorf** says a damascene structure is used and **Ueno** teaches and/or defines the notoriously well known steps for forming the damascene structure.

Then the only difference is that **Ritzdorf** does not teach the limitation that measuring the actual thickness of the copper layer comprises, “averaging a plurality of thicknesses from a plurality of locations” on said first copper layer.

Breiner teaches a method of process control during semiconductor fabrication by feedback from metrology tools (col. 3, lines 25-67) citing specific examples, wherein the data, including the thickness of deposited metal layers (col. 4, lines 20-25), is data that may be used to provide process control feedback. It is further stated therein that,

“The wafer data may be collected and tracked on a per wafer basis, per lot basis, per process run basis or combinations thereof. Further, the data may include **multiple measurements for each data point, mean values, median values**, range of values, standard deviations, **wafer maps** of the collected data, etc.” (col. 4, lines 60-65).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to “average a plurality of thicknesses from a plurality of locations” in determining the uniformity in **Ritzdorf**, in order to make the “wafer map” of thickness which shows the thickness globally and also provides a visual mapping of the uniformity, as taught in **Breiner**.

Regarding claim 7, it is seen to be inherent that the actual thickness is measured at a plurality of locations, because **Ritzdorf** indicates that the uniformity is determined thereby requiring the thickness determination at several points. (See MPEP 2112.)

Regarding claims 8 and 9, the prior art of **Ritzdorf**, as explained above, discloses each of the claimed features except for indicating that the measuring of the thickness at a plurality of locations includes determining the average or median of the actual measured thickness.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to use the average or median (called “mean” in **Breiner**) of the plurality of points measured in

Art Unit: 2813

Ritzdorf as taught in **Breiner** because the average or median values would provide a more precise measure of the thickness over the entire wafer than would a collection of un-analyzed or un-reduced thickness measurements.

Regarding claims 10-12, the prior art of **Ritzdorf**, as explained above, discloses each of the claimed features except for indicating that the measuring of the thickness at a plurality of locations, inherently disclosed in **Ritzdorf**, includes comparing the desired thickness to each of the plurality of measured thicknesses (claim 10) or comparing the desired thickness to the average (claim 11) or median values (claim 12) of the thickness.

As noted above, **Breiner** teaches that the any of the above-highlighted data (each of the plurality of thicknesses, the average thickness, or the median thickness) provide feedback for process control. Feedback necessarily requires comparison of measured data to some desired value, otherwise there would exist no direction in which to modify the process to move in the direction of the desired value, and consequently no control could be provided. Moreover, **Breiner** provides examples of process control based upon feedback of measured thickness (col. 6, lines 15-32 and col. 7, lines 15-38).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to compare the measured data (each of the plurality of thicknesses, the average thickness, or the median thickness) as taught by **Breiner** in the method of **Ritzdorf**, because **Ritzdorf** indicates that thickness and uniformity are data used to modify the process of depositing copper and because **Breiner** teaches that any of the measured data (each of the plurality of thicknesses, the average thickness, or the median thickness) may be used to provide feedback (i.e. comparison to a desired value) for process control.

6. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,428,673 B1 (**Ritzdorf** et al.) in view of US 6,221,765 B1 (**Ueno**) and US 6,211,094 B1 (**Jun** et al.; reference provided by Applicant in the IDS filed 27 August 2003 [Paper no. 16]).

Regarding claims 1 and 22, **Ritzdorf** discloses a method for controlling a thickness of an electroplated copper layer including damascene layers (col. 3, lines 10-21) using feedback from metrology comprising,

forming a first copper layer;

measuring an actual thickness of the copper layer;

comparing the actual thickness to a desired thickness; and

varying at least one parameter used to form the first copper layer in response to the actual thickness differing from the desired thickness. (See Abstract; col. 3, line 64 to col. 4, line 15; col. 4, lines 37-65; col. 5, lines 2-5; col. 7, lines 36-45; col. 8, lines 49-53.)

Ritzdorf does not indicate that the mechanical stress relating to said first copper layer is measured and used for process control but, as noted, **Ritzdorf** suggests measurement of “other parameters” (called “metrology data”) of the copper layer and the used of the measured other parameters to feedback or feed forward process control (*inter alia* at col. 9, lines 50-65).

Ueno teaches an electroplated damascene copper structure (e.g. in Fig. 1) wherein compressive stress is intentionally introduced into the copper layer during fabrication to prevent void generation (col. 3, lines 23-48).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to measure and use for process control (in the claim language “varying at least one parameter

Art Unit: 2813

used to form the first copper layer in response to) the mechanical stress in order to ensure and to control the quantity of compressive stress in the copper layer to thereby prevent stress-induced voiding, as taught by **Ueno** -- especially since **Ritzdorf** suggests measuring other parameters of the copper layer and use the measured parameters for process feedback and feed forward control.

Both **Ritzdorf** and **Ueno** are drawn to electroplated damascene copper interconnect for semiconductor device fabrication and therefore, one of ordinary skill is ensured a reasonable expectation of success in combining the references.

Ritzdorf does not describe the damascene process disclosed therein.

Ueno teaches the basic copper damascene process known to one of ordinary skill also includes the formation of the dielectric with the opening, or in Applicant's claim language,

forming a first dielectric layer **2** above a first structure layer **1**;

forming a first opening **5** in the first dielectric layer **2** (called "trench patterning and "via patterning");

forming a first copper layer **6** above the first dielectric layer **2** and in the first opening **5**.

(See **Ueno** Figs. 1-5.)

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to form the damascene structure in **Ritzdorf**, according to steps indicated in **Ueno**, because **Ritzdorf** says a damascene structure is used and **Ueno** teaches and/or defines the notoriously well known steps for forming the damascene structure.

Then the only difference is that **Ritzdorf** does not teach the limitation that measuring the actual thickness of the copper layer comprises, "averaging a plurality of thicknesses from a plurality of locations" on said first copper layer.

Jun teaches a method of process control during semiconductor fabrication by feedback from metrology tools (Abstract; Figs. 4A-4B), specifically including “averaging a plurality of thicknesses from a plurality of locations” to determine the actual thickness of the deposited layer --as further limited by instant claim 8-- and using this data to provide process control feedback to adjust the deposition process parameters (col. 4, lines 20-67 -- especially “TABLE 1”).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to “average a plurality of thicknesses from a plurality of locations” to provide process feedback data in **Ritzdorf**, in order to better control the deposition process, as taught in **Jun**.

Regarding claim 7, it is seen to be inherent that the actual thickness is measured at a plurality of locations, because **Ritzdorf** indicates that the uniformity is determined thereby requiring the thickness determination at several points. (See MPEP 2112.)

Regarding claims 10 and 11, comparing the actual thickness to the desired thickness comprises comparing the desired thickness to each of the plurality of measure thicknesses (**Jun** Table 1 --especially the footnote to Table 1) and also comparing the desired thickness to the average thickness (col. 4, last paragraph).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to “average a plurality of thicknesses from a plurality of locations” to provide process feedback data in **Ritzdorf**, in order to better control the deposition process, as taught in **Jun**.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2813

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erik Kielin whose telephone number is 571-272-1693. The examiner can normally be reached from 9:00 - 19:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr. can be reached on 571-272-1702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Erik Kielin
Primary Examiner
June 4, 2005